26th March 1929] [Mr. K. V. R. Swami]

pact about this matter, viz., that one should object to this Bill being passed into law and the other should give assurance and after which the objection should be withdrawn. It is a very nice arrangement between them and I do not quarrel with them. That may be a very good thing so far as those two gentlemen are concerned. My hon. Friend Mr. Anjaneyulu represents the members of this party or the members of this House as much as my hon. Friend the Zamindar of Gollapalli represents the whole body of zamindars. So, their agreement is as much binding on the members of this House as it is on the zamindars. I want to make my position very clear. I have nothing to do with this pact or compromise. It is not for us to go on bended knees and ask these zamindars whose estates have been made impartible 'Please protect your children, do not allow them to be at the public charge.' It is not our business. If this House consents to a Bill like this, it must have taken into its consideration how these poor children ought to be protected. This House ought to have taken into their consideration whether these children of the zamindars have been well provided, or whether they have to go to court or whether they have to be protected by other people. That is a different thing altogether. Our objection to this Bill is that we should not perpetuate a system which was brought into existence at the time of the East India Company. Because at the time of the East India Company they sold away certain portions of their territories to a class of people called the zamindars and they collected permanent revenue from them and while selling those portions they also sold away the interests of the people, who were really in possession of portions of the lands in their own right, we do not want that the same system should be continued. Now if estates after estates should come forward with a Bill of this sort and want to make this system of impartible estates a permanent institution as it were, we have to oppose it, because it is not in the interest of the people that these zamindaris should be perpetuated as long as the world lasts. If the people think that some of these impartible estates newly created do no good to the people, they can as well when they are sufficiently strong bring in a Bill into this Council and repeal these Acts. So, it is no good on the part of any hon. Member of this House to give an assurance that we are quite satisfied with this Bill and that the only thing that we want is that the children of the zamindari families should be given sufficient allowance for their maintenance and so on. Of course my hon. Friend Sir A. P. Patro says: 'It is quite right, you can keep quiet.' I am told he is a little bit of a zamindar himself and he may perhaps introduce a Bill called Sir Patro's Bill. But representing as we do the interests of the people, we ought to see how their interests are jeopardized by this Bill. We are more interested in the general public than my hon. Friend is interested in the body of the zamindars and so I make my position quite clear and oppose the passing of this Bill."

The motion was put and carried and the Bill was passed into law.

VII

A BILL TO AMEND THE MADRAS ABKARI ACT, 1886.

Mr. J. A. Saldanha :—"I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Madras Abkari Act, 1886, as amended by the Select Committee be taken into consideration."

Mr. D. Narayana Raju :—"I second it."

Clause 1.

Mr. J. A. Saldanha :—" I beg to move that in clause 1 the figures '1929' be substituted for the figures '1928'."

Mr. D. Narayana Raju :—" I second it."

The amendment was put and carried.

Clause 1 as amended was put, passed and added to the Bill.

Clauses 2 *and* 3.

* The hon. Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar :—" I beg to move that in place of clause 2 the following shall be substituted :—

' 2. *To section* 15 *of the Madras Abkari Act*, 1886 (*hereinafter referred to as the said Act*), *the following explanation shall be added, namely* :—

" *Explanation.—The supply of liquor by clubs to their members on payment of a price or of any fee or subscription is not a sale within the meaning of this section but a fee according to a scale of fees to be fixed by the Government shall be levied from such clubs by the Commissioner.*" '

" Sir, the object of the amendment of Mr. Saldanha is that these clubs which are selling liquor shall not be in a more advantageous position than the shops. His view is that these shops are handicapped because of compulsory licences and that both the clubs and the shops should have licences from the Commissioner. Licences make certain sections of the Abkari Act applicable and these sections refer to the amount of liquor and the quality of liquor which is to be kept in shops. As regards clubs the members will satisfy themselves as to the quality of liquor. So compulsory licences are not necessary in the case of clubs. The Government are only concerned with the revenue and so far as that is concerned the fee proposed in the amendment will do. The Government agree that a fee might be levied from these clubs just as it is levied from these shops. So, I move that the explanation that I have moved above may be added to section 15. (An hon. Member: ' Why not move clause by clause ? ')

" Sir, an hon. Member suggests that I should move clause by clause. So I move the first amendment to section 15 as above."

* The hon. the President :—" I find it is necessary that both the clauses must be amended in the order in which they are proposed by the hon. Minister. Therefore it is much better to discuss the whole amendment and put each clause of the hon. Minister to the vote of the House separately. I think that will be more convenient."

The hon. Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar :—" The second amendment that I wish to move runs as follows :—

' 3. *To section* 36 *of the said Act the following proviso shall be added, namely* :—

" *Provided that the persons called upon to attend and witness such searches shall include at least two persons neither of whom is an abkari, police or village officer.*" '

26th March 1929] [Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar]

"Sir, the section as amended by the Select Committee says that the witnesses shall not be Government officials and the witnesses shall be non-officials. Government accept that two may be non-officials, but I want to point out that officials should not be absolutely debarred from being witnesses. The Bill states that two of the witnesses shall be non-officials and we have no objection to that, but why should we debar Government officials from being witnesses to a search. That is the reason for my amendment. I move that this amendment may be accepted."

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—" I second it."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" In the Bill of Mr. Saldanha, clause 2 deals with section 36 of the Act, whereas clause 3 deals with section 15 of the Act. Generally the amending Bills will have to deal with these clauses in their numerical order. That is the only mistake I find. However, I think the whole debate may go on and the clauses may be put as proposed by the hon. the Minister.

"The question is 'for clauses 2 and 3 of the Select Committee Report, the amendments of the hon. the Minister be substituted'." 4 p.m.

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Sir, so far as the first amendment is concerned, after a careful examination of my own original proposal which I framed on the Bombay law and the amendment proposed by the hon. Minister, I do not think there is any essential difference between the two. The reason why the Bombay Government introduced the Bill was to have control over the sale of liquor in clubs. The Bombay Government say that the disposal of liquor in the clubs is not a sale. A letter was received from the Government of Bombay and it was circulated to the hon. Members of the Council. It says: 'I am to state that previously to 1st April 1928, the secretary of each club was required to submit to the Collector of the district on the 1st April and the 1st October every year, in such form as the Collector prescribed, a true and correct account of all spirits received, consumed and held in stock at the club. On receipt of this information the Collector assessed the fee for each club on the basis of the purchases made by it during the previous six months in accordance with the following scale :—' My amendment and the amendment of the hon. Minister are practically the same. The sale of liquor and the disposal of liquor come under the control of the Revenue authorities, i.e., the Excise Department, and they levy a fee.

"The question whether it is a sale or not is left to the discretion of the Government either in Bombay or here, and they can fix any fee they like; they have got all sorts of arbitrary fees; for certain shops a fee of Rs. 250 is levied; for some shops it is Rs. 1,000. If the sale of liquor is by casks, a fee of Rs. 1,000 is levied; if it is in bottles, a fee of Rs. 500 is levied. Once the clubs are brought under the control of the authorities, the Government are at liberty to fix any fees they like. The Government will be anxious to fix as high a fee as is consistent with the necessities of the situation and requirements. So far as that clause is concerned, I raise no serious objection, though the form of my amendment would have been better. As for the other amendment, I think there is serious objection. My original intention was to see that these searches should be made in the presence of non-officials and that there should be no official witnesses at all, so that responsible independent witnesses will be able to give evidence. The effect of the amendment of the hon. Minister is this: there will be five persons; two of them are

to be non-officials, others may be officials. The tendency of a subordinate magistrate would be to accept the evidence of the officials. As long as we have not got magistrates who are not independent, they would be influenced by the official evidence, because they are dependent on their superior officers. I therefore object to the second amendment."

Mr. K. R. Karant :—" Sir, I am surprised to see my hon. Friend, Mr. Saldanha, accepting the amendment of the Government which has a far-reaching effect. Two points are involved in this amendment. I shall first deal with the amendment to section 15. The chief objection is that the quantity of liquor sold in these clubs is not known and secondly they do not pay any income to the Government. There is the question of finance and the question of having an idea of the exact amount of sale ; there is the question also of the provisions that are consequential upon section 15 of the Abkari Act. This is not a new amendment. In fact, the amendment in the Select Committee Report has been incorporated word for word from the amendment to a Bill brought forward by a Bombay Member of Government in the year 1925. The wording of that Bill, which was passed without any amendment in the Council, is as follows :—' Supply of liquor to their members on payment of any fee or subscription is a sale within the meaning of this section.' The speech of the Abkari Commissioner who made a long speech explaining the necessity for this Bill is found at pages 824 to 829 of the proceedings of the Bombay Legislative Council on 31st July 1925. I shall quote a few passages to show that the conditions in this Presidency are not very different from those in Bombay except perhaps that we have not got as many bogus clubs as there are in Bombay. The reasons given by the Abkari Commissioner of Excise are as follows :—' The first reason was, as mentioned by the hon. Member, the recommendation of the Excise Committee. It was found that if you are to control country liquor effectively, you must simultaneously—at least to a certain extent—control foreign liquor.' If we accept the amendment of the Government, we shall not be able to have any check on the quantity of foreign liquor sold in clubs, because it will not come under section 15 of the Act. I think, Sir, I have made my position clear. Section 15 says that sale of foreign liquor in these shops is not a sale. The amendment of the hon. Minister is that it is not a sale and it authorizes the Government to collect a certain fee ; nothing more than that. The Government will have no power to reduce or control the quantity which power they have under the provisions of section 15 of the Act and other sections consequential upon it. That section says that no liquor can be sold without a licence from the Collector. If we accept the amendment of the Government, the Government would be entitled only to collect certain fees from these clubs ; the sale of liquor cannot be prohibited or controlled ; nor will there be any necessity to obtain a licence from the Collector. I shall quote further the speech of the Member of the Bombay Council : ' There was a border line over which these two practically overlapped. The second reason was that these bogus clubs began to increase enormously. Probably hon. Members do not know the number of such clubs now existing in the city of Bombay itself. Some of them are in the very heart of the Fort and they are doing a very good business. The third reason is finance. Really these clubs are doing serious damage to our excise revenue, because many of the restaurants and shops near these bogus clubs had practically to shut down and this has reduced our revenue. I want to point out that even exclusive clubs like the Carlton, the Athæneum, and

26th March 1929] [Mr. K. R. Karant]

Marlborough of London, clubs of which His Majesty the King is a regular member, are all licensed in England and I do not see what objection there can be to the licensing of our Indian clubs. What I wanted to point out was that this Act is really concerned with the control and it is not directly concerned with licensing conditions. I am sure that no genuine club need be afraid of these conditions which will have to be approved by Government after due consideration of the status of these clubs. In any case these rules are proposed to be based exactly on the same lines as the rules in England so that there will be no greater restrictions in India than in England. In fact I think that in England the restrictions are still greater. Probably hon. Members are not aware that English clubs come under two Acts, the Licensing Act under which every club has to be registered and there are very strict rules laid down. One of these conditions is that no member can send for a single bottle of liquor from the premises of these clubs, for being drunk outside but it is not so here. Again the clubs have to submit many returns and for each return they have got to pay a fee of five shillings. And again, they are under a second Act, namely, the Finance Act, under which they have got to pay six pence on every pound of purchase. I wanted to point out to the hon. Member that in England this extra payment of six pence has to be made. I do not think it is necessary for me to mention any other facts. All I can say is that this provision is essential for the proper carrying out of Government policy and to put a stop to or a check on the increasing demand for cheap foreign liquor.'

"I think I have made it sufficiently clear that the two points to which the Member of the Bombay Government referred to were accepted by the Council. It was a Bill brought forward by the Government. It was not strongly opposed even by the European Members of the Council. The two points are, all clubs come under section 15 of the Act and the supply of liquor in these clubs is sale within the meaning of the section. The amendment brought forward by the Government says that the supply of liquor by clubs is not a sale. The Government simply collects a little fee from these clubs. These are points to which we cannot agree. I hope the hon. Mover of this Bill will reconsider his position in the light of what I have submitted.

"Regarding the second amendment, I must submit that the amendment of the hon Minister makes the position worse than what it is at present.

"The position now is that under section 36 of the Abkari Act, 'searches under the provisions of this Act shall be made in accordance with the provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure'. Now, if you refer to the Code of Criminal Procedure, it says how a search has to be made. Section 103 (1) runs as follows:— 4-15 p.m.

'Before making a search under this Chapter, the officer or other person about to make it shall call upon two or more respectable inhabitants of the locality in which the place to be searched is situate to attend and witness the search, and may issue an order in writing to them or any of them so to do.'

"The important point to be noticed in connexion with this is that the officer about to make a search shall have to call upon two respectable inhabitants of the locality. As the law stands at present, I understand that ordinarily no abkari officer or a Government servant can be an attestor to a search. The section contemplates two important respectable inhabitants of the locality. If you take the natural meaning of the section, I take it

that any abkari officer cannot in any ordinary sense be a respectable inhabitant of the locality. Now, the amendment of the hon. Minister means that there may be more than two witnesses, say five witnesses or any number of witnesses, but at least two of them shall not be abkari officers or police or village officers, thereby impliedly meaning that there may be two independent witnesses, but the other may be abkari or village officers. Now, the danger in this is that a search may be attested by two independent witnesses. There is no guarantee as regards the exclusion of the abkari or village officers from being witnesses in a court of law. In a court of law only two independent witnesses should be called. Now, if a search is attended by four persons, Government may choose to summon only the abkari or village officers and leave out the independent witnesses of the locality. Therefore, my humble submission is that this amendment only takes us to a position which is worse than the existing law. If we give a proper meaning to the Criminal Procedure Code, the abkari or police or village officers are not respectable persons of the locality and it would not be proper for them to attest searches.

"If we accept the amendment of the hon. the Minister, which provides:

'*Provided that the persons called upon to attend and witness such searches shall include at least two persons neither of whom is an abkari, police or village officer.*'

"Thereby, this amendment indirectly permits persons who are abkari, village or police officers to attest. There is nothing in it compelling two respectable inhabitants of the locality to be cited as witnesses by Government because all persons who attest a search are not liable to be called to prove the search. According to the amendment of the Minister, there can be any number of persons, but there must be at least two respectable inhabitants, and there is no rule that two independent respectable inhabitants alone are entitled to speak about the search so that it will be open to the Abkari department to cite only those persons of the Abkari or Police department to prove the search. Therefore, it is my humble conviction that the present amendment is worse than the existing law and should not be accepted. I hope therefore that both the amendments of the hon. Minister will be thrown out and the Bill as it stands will be accepted by the House."

* Mr. P. C. VENKATAPATI RAJU :—" Mr. President, Sir, the explanation that is sought to be introduced by the hon. the Minister for Excise to section 15 of the Madras Abkari Act is really an exposition of his real intentions with regard to prohibition in this country. I can understand the hon. Minister saying that with regard to the financial adjustments, some time may be required for bringing in the prohibition law. Here is an amendment to the Abkari Act brought by an hon. Member wherein there is a possibility of public finances being increased instead of being diminished, and at the same time advancing the cause of prohibition The explanation which he seeks to introduce really defeats the purpose of the very amendment of the hon. the Private Member and I agree along with my hon. Friend, Mr Karant, with the remark that the hon. Member, the mover of the Bill, has shown some sort of consideration to the Minister's amendment. The hon. Minister was saying that he was for the restriction of drink and that he was for the abolition of shops. Now, perhaps, the hon. Minister wants that if shops are closed, further clubs should crop up. There is nothing in the Abkari Act to prevent the sale of

26th March 1929]

[Mr. P. C. Venkatapati Raju]

even country liquor by the clubs and the special object of getting a reduction in drink by abolishing some of the shops in the localities cannot be achieved, if this amendment is carried, for some sort of club will crop up, may be a club of drunkards with some other name and they will be at liberty to sell any sort of liquor to any extent till any time and at the same time not pay any revenue to the public finances. My hon. Friend the Excise Minister was always trying to take precedents from the Bombay Government. Anything that is done by the Bombay Government which fails to bring any desired effect will certainly be placed before us and that he says he is going to follow the example of the Bombay Government. In this even the Bombay Government has stated that supply of liquor to members of the club is a sale under the Abkari Act. Now, he wants this House to make it not a sale and the object of the hon. Minister is not really in public interests or even in the interests of the finances of this province Therefore, I think that this amendment should not be accepted and I think the hon. Minister for Excise would give up his amendment and allow the amendment brought forward by the hon. Mr. Saldanha to go without much opposition and without taking up much time of the House."

* Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO :—" Mr. President, Sir I do not intend taking more than a few minutes. The hon Minister has achieved his aim of prohibition but enlarged the quantity of drink by his explanation. My hon. Friend from South Kanara did not notice evidently that the Bombay Government in the reply that they gave had control over the quantity that the clubs could use. They have also other expedients by which they can control the drink in clubs and they have also other safeguards. They have specifically declared that it was a sale within the meaning of the Abkari Act. Here the whole thing is topsy-turvy. Our hon. Minister who has devoted 4 lakhs for propaganda work now comes forward with an explanation which would bring in a crop of clubs day by day, where people might drink whatever quantity they liked. Moreover, the Commissioner of Excise has a right of fixing the rates, and in the case of clubs there rates might possibly be lower than the others and that will be another incentive to further drink. Therefore, this kind of amendment is absolutely futile and it only conveys to this House and to the world the policy of the Minister. If it is not intended that his policy should be consummated in this manner, it is well that he withdraws his motion."

Mr. W. P. A. SOUNDARA PANDIA NADAR :—" I move that the question be now put."

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that the question be now put "

The closure motion was put to the House and declared carried.

Mr. K. R. Karant demanded a poll and the House divided thus :

Ayes.

1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks.
2. ,, Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur.
3. ,, Mr. T. E. Moir.
4. ,, Diwan Bahadur Krishnan Nayar.
5. The hon. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.
6. ,, Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar.
7. ,, Dr. P. Subbarayan
8. Mr. Hilton Brown.
9. ,, H. A. Watson.
10. ,, S. H. Slater.

Ayes—cont.

11. Mr. C. A. Souter.
12. ,, A. McG. C. Tampoe.
13. ,, C. W. E. Cotton.
14. ,, V. Ch. John.
15. ,, M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.
16. Syed Tajudin Sahib Bahadur.
17. Mr. J. Bheemayya.
18. ,, R. Foulkes.
19. Muhamud Schamnad Sahib Bahadur.
20. Mr. J. Kuppuswami.
21. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappah Bahadur.
22. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.
23. ,, K. Krishnan.
24. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami.
25. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
26. ,, W. P. A. Soundara Pandia Nadar.
27. ,, S. Venkiah.
28. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.
29. Mr. W. O. Wright.
30. ,, F. E. James.
31. ,, R. J. C. Robertson.
32. Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar.
33. Zamindar of Kallikota.
34. Khan Sahib P. Kalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur.
35. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
36. Mr. V. Ramjee Rao.
37. Zamindar of Gollapalli.
38. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi.
39. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar.
40. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.
41. Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu.
42. Mr. P. T. Rajan.
43. ,, T. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar.
44. ,, Khadir Mohidin Sahib.
45. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar.
46. Rao Bahadur K. Sitarama Reddi.
47. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.
48. Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
49. Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri.
50. Mr. A. B. Bhanoji Rao.

Noes.

1. Mr. P. C. Venkatapati Raju.
2. ,, K. Koti Reddi.
3. ,, R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
4. ,, Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
5. ,, S. Satyamurti.
6. ,, J. A. Saldanha.
7. ,, G. Harisarvottama Rao.
8. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib Bahadur.
9. Mr. C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar.
10. Abdul Hameed Khan Sahib Bahadur.
11. Mr. K. V. R. Swami.
12. ,, D. Narayana Raju.
13. Dr. B. S. Mallayya.
14. Mr. K. R. Karant.
15. ,, P. Anjaneyulu.
16. ,, A. Parasurama Rao.
17. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo.
18. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao.
19. ,, K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar.
20. ,, C. Obi Reddi.
21. ,, C. Venkatarangam Nayudu.
22. ,, K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar.
23. ,, A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
24. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.

Ayes 50. Noes 24.

The closure motion was carried.

4-30 p.m. * The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I now put the main motion to the vote of the House. In doing so I shall put it in three parts.

'Re-number clauses 2 and 3 as 3 and 2 respectively. That is only a verbal amendment.' "

The motion was put to vote and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" For clause 2 as re-numbered, substitute clause 2 as in the motion of the Minister, viz., 'To section 15 of the Madras Abkari Act, 1886 (hereinafter referred to as the said Act), the following explanation shall be added, namely :—

'*Explanation.*—The supply of liquor by clubs to their members on payment of a price or of any fee or subscription is not a sale within the meaning of this section but a fee according to a scale of fees to be fixed by the Government shall be levied from such clubs by the Commissioner.' "

26th March 1929]*

The motion was put to vote and lost. A poll was demanded and the House divided thus :

Ayes.

1. The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks.
2. ,, Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur.
3. ,, Mr. T. E. Moir.
4. ,, Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.
5. ,, Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.
6. ,, Mr. S. Muthiah Mudaliyar.
7. ,, Dr. P. Subbarayan.
8. Mr. Hilton Brown.
9. ,, H. A. Watson.
10. ,, C. A. Souter.
11. ,, S. H. Slater.
12. ,, A. McG. C. Tampoe.
13. ,, C. W. E. Cotton.
14. ,, V. Ch. John.
15. ,, M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar.
16. ,, Muhammad Syed Tajudin Sahib.
17. ,, J. Bheemayya.
18. ,, R. Foulkes.
19. ,, Mahmud Schamnad Sahib.
20. ,, J. Kuppuswami.
21. Subadar-Major S. A. Nanjappah Bahadur.
22. Mr. T. M. Narayanaswami Pillai.
23. ,, K. Krishnan.
24. Rao Sahib L. C. Guruswami.
25. Mr. V. I. Muniswami Pillai.
26. ,, W. P. A. Soundara Pandia Nadar.
27. ,, S. Venkiah.
28. Rao Sahib R. Srinivasan.
29. Mr. W. O. Wright.
30. ,, F. E. James.
31. ,, R. J. C. Robertson.
32. ,, S. Arpudaswami Udayar.
33. Zamindar of Kallikota.
34. Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur.
35. Swami A. S. Sahajanandam.
36. Mr. V. Ramjee Rao.
37. Zamindar of Gollapalli.
38. Rao Bahadur Sir A. P. Patro.
39. Diwan Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu.
40. Mr. P. T. Rajan.
41. ,, T. K. Chidambaranatha Mudaliyar.
42. Muhammad Kadir Mohidin Sahib.
43. Diwan Bahadur S. Kumaraswami Reddiyar.
44. Rao Bahadur K. Sitarama Reddi.
45. The Zamindar of Mirzapuram.
46. Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao.

Noes.

1. Mr. P. C. Venkatapati Raju.
2. ,, K. Koti Reddi.
3. ,, R. Srinivasa Ayyangar.
4. ,, Sami Venkatachalam Chetti.
5. ,, S. Satyamurti.
6. ,, J. A. Saldanha.
7. ,, G. Harisarvottama Rao.
8. ,, Basheer Ahmed Sayeed Sahib.
9. ,, C. S. Govindaraja Mudaliyar.
10. ,, Abdul Hameed Khan.
11. ,, K. V. R. Swami.
12. ,, D. Narayana Raju.
13. Dr. B. S. Mallayya.
14. Mr. K. R. Karant.
15. Mr. P. Anjaneyulu.
16. ,, C. Obi Reddi.
17. ,, A. Parasurama Rao.
18. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo.
19. Mr. A. Kaleswara Rao.
20. ,, K. V. Krishnaswami Nayakar.
21. ,, C. Venkatarangam Nayudu.
22. ,, K. S. Sivasubrahmanya Ayyar.
23. ,, A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
24. Diwan Bahadur R. N. Arogyaswami Mudaliyar.
25. Rao Bahadur C. S. Ratnasabhapati Mudaliyar.
26. Rao Bahadur B. Muniswami Nayudu.

Neutral.

1. Mr. B. Ramachandra Reddi.
2. Kumara Raja of Venkatagiri.

Ayes 46. Noes 26. Neutral 2.

The motion was carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" For clause 3 as re-numbered, substitute clause 3 in the hon. the Minister's motion, namely, 'To section 36 of the said Act, the following proviso shall be added, namely, " Provided that the persons called upon to attend and witness such searches shall include at least two persons neither of whom is an abkari, police or village officer ".' "

*The motion was put to vote and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is that clauses 2 and 3 as amended shall stand part of the Bill."

The motion was put to vote and carried.

[26th March 1929

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Now the preamble is for the consideration of the House."

The hon. Mr. S. MUTHIAH MUDALIYAR :—" I move that in line 1 before the words ' to amend ' insert the word ' further '; in line 2 after the figures ' 1886 ' insert the words ' for the purpose hereinafter appearing '; in line 3 omit the words ' and of the Governor '; and in line 4 for the words ' it is enacted ' substitute the words ' it is hereby enacted '."

The hon. Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—" I second the motion."

The preamble amendment was then put and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The question is the preamble as amended do stand part of the Bill "

The motion was put to vote and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The amendment of the title standing in the name of the hon. the Minister is more a business of the Secretary, and I therefore do not put it to the vote of the House."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" I do not make any motion that the Bill be passed into law."

VIII

A BILL TO DECLARE THE ELLAMARRU AND PENJENDRA ESTATES IMPARTIBLE.

Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" Sir, I beg to move that the Bill to declare the Ellamarru and Penjendra Estates to be impartible be taken into consideration."

The ZAMINDAR OF GOLLAPALLI :—" I second the motion."

The motion was put and carried.

* The hon the PRESIDENT :—" Clause 1 is for the consideration of the House. In clause 1 for the figures ' 1928 ' substitute ' 1929 '."

Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" In clause 1 for the figures ' 1928 ' substitute ' 1929 '."

The motion was put and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Clause 2 is for the consideration of the House.

" (After a pause) The question is that clauses 2 and 3 shall stand part of the Bill."

The motion was put and carried.

* The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The preamble is for the consideration of the House.

" The question is the preamble shall stand part of the Bill."

The motion was put and carried.

Diwan Bahadur S. KUMARASWAMI REDDIYAR :—" I now move the Bill be passed into law."

Mr. P. T. RAJAN :—" I second it."